

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NATHANIEL WADDELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

A. MINTON, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [20-cv-01467-SI](#)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

On June 15, 2020, mail was sent from the court to plaintiff at the address he provided to the court and was returned undelivered on July 13, 2020, bearing a stamp that stated “return to sender – not deliverable as addressed – unable to forward.” Docket No. 15. Plaintiff has not provided a more recent address than the address to which the undeliverable mail was sent. More than sixty days have passed since the mail was returned to the court undelivered. Plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 3-11(a) which requires a party proceeding *pro se* to “promptly file with the Court and serve upon all opposing parties a Notice of Change of Address specifying the new address” when his address changes. Local Rule 3-11(b) allows the court to dismiss a complaint without prejudice when mail directed to a *pro se* party is returned as not deliverable and the *pro se* party fails to send written notice of his current address within sixty days of the return of the undelivered mail. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice because plaintiff failed to keep the court informed of his address in compliance with Local Rule 3-11(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 20, 2020



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge